REMARKS/ARGUMENT

1) Claims 1-4, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wesby et al 6,799,044. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as set forth below.

In order that the rejection of Claims 1-4, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18-20 be sustainable, it is fundamental that "each and every element as set forth in the claim be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). See also, Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989), where the court states, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim".

Furthermore, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Independent Claim 1, as amended, requires and positively recites: An information storage apparatus, comprising: "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", "an information storage apparatus coupled to said input for storing said information", "an output for coupling to an output information transfer path that extends to a further wireless communication apparatus", "said information storage apparatus coupled to said output for providing said information to said output" and "said output for, when coupled to said output information transfer path, providing said information to the further wireless communication apparatus **for use by the further wireless communication apparatus in determining whether the desired communication session will be established".**

In contrast, Wesby teaches a method for distributing C/I performance to all mobile stations, implementing "the well-known ultimate goal that C/I should be homogeneously distributed over all receivers in the network at any point in time" (Column 1, lines 53-55). Wesby implements this using a base station controller (BSC) to which a number of base stations (BTS) are connected and in which **the BSC contains "means for performing channel allocation** for a particular radio connection **to the mobile station** based upon the calculated signal to interference **estimate** for the mobile station (Column 3, lines 27-34). The BTS implements the BSC commands: "The BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC" (Column 6, lines 46-48). The storage of the C/I information "is needed at the BSC", (Column 6, lines 53-54) not the wireless mobile communication apparatus as required by Claim 1.

The collected information in Wesby is based upon field strength (FS) measurements reported by the MS (column 7, line 4). The BSC already knows the "BCCH frequency and the base station identity code BSIC" (Column 7, line 23-24) thereby, **enabling the BSC to identify the operating cell and to identify all allocated channels in this cell c** (Column 7, line 33). Therefore, the MS makes measurements of field strength, but fails to identify **frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus** as required by Claim 1. Wesby's **Base Station Controller**, having identified the operating cell and all allocated channels in this cell c (Column 7, line 33) "**builds a real-time matrix** of BTS transmission power values for all frequencies and all time slots for all cells". Therefore, the BSC identifies the frequency channels, not the wireless mobile communication apparatus as required by Claim 1.

Nowhere, however, does Wesby teach or suggest, "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", as further required by Claim 1.

In addition, Wesby's "**BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies** independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). Wesby does not teach or suggest that the **mobile communication apparatus** (Mobile Station) participates "in **determining whether the desired communication session will be established**" as required by Claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of Claim 1 is overcome.

Independent Claim 19 requires and positively recites, A method of storing information, comprising: "coupling an input to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", "coupling an information storage apparatus to said input for storing said information", "coupling an output to an output information transfer path that extends to a further wireless communication apparatus", "coupling said information storage apparatus to said output for providing said information to said output" and "selectively coupling said output to said output information transfer path to provide said information to the further wireless communication apparatus **for use by the further wireless communication apparatus in determining** whether the desired communication session will be established".

In contrast, Wesby teaches a method for distributing C/I performance to all mobile stations, implementing "the well-known ultimate goal that C/I should be homogeneously distributed over all receivers in the network at any point in time." (Column 1, lines 53-55.) Wesby implements this using a base station controller (BSC) to which a number of base stations (BTS) are connected and in which **the BSC contains "means for performing channel allocation** for a particular radio connection **to the mobile station** based upon the calculated signal to interference **estimate** for the mobile station (Column 3, lines 27-34). The BTS implements the BSC commands: "The BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). The storage of the C/I information "is needed at the BSC", (Column 6, lines 53-54) not the mobile station as required by Claim 19. The collected information is based upon field strength (FS) measurements reported by the MS (column 7, line 4). The BSC already knows the "BCCH frequency and the base station identity code BSIC" (Column 7, line 23-24) thereby, **enabling the BSC to identify the operating cell and to identify all allocated channels in this cell c** (Column 7, line 33). Therefore, the MS makes measurements of field strength, but fails to identify **frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, as required by Claim 19. The **Base Station Controller**, having identified the operating cell and all allocated channels in this cell c (Column 7, line 33) "**builds a real-time matrix** of BTS transmission power values for all frequencies and all time slots for all cells". Therefore, the BSC identifies the frequency channels, not the wireless mobile communication apparatus as required by Claim 19.

Similarly, Wesby fails to teach or suggest, "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", as required by Claim 19.

Moreover, Wesby's "**BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies** independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). Wesby does not teach or suggest that the **mobile communication apparatus** (Mobile Station) participates "in **determining whether the desired communication session will be established**" as required by Claim 19. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of Claim 19 is overcome.

Independent Claim 20 requires and positively recites, A method of storing information, comprising the steps of: "**receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", "storing said information;" and "making said stored information available **for use by another wireless communication apparatus in determining** whether the desired communication session will be established".

In contrast, Wesby teaches a method for distributing C/I performance to all mobile stations, implementing "the well-known ultimate goal that C/I should be homogeneously distributed over all receivers in the network at any point in time." (Column 1, lines 53-55.)

Wesby implements this using a base station controller (BSC) to which a number of base stations (BTS) are connected and in which **the BSC contains "means for performing channel allocation** for a particular radio connection **to the mobile station** based upon the calculated signal to interference **estimate** for the mobile station. (Column 3, lines 27-34). The BTS implements the BSC commands: "The BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). The storage of the C/I information "is needed at the BSC", (Column 6, lines 53-54) not the mobile station as required in Claim 20. The collected information is based upon field strength (FS) measurements reported by the MS (column 7, line 4). The BSC already knows the "BCCH frequency and the base station identity code BSIC" (Column 7, line 23-24) thereby, **enabling the BSC to identify the operating cell and to identify all allocated channels in this cell c** (Column 7, line 33). Therefore, the MS makes measurements of field strength, but fails to identify **frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, as required by Claim 20. The **Base Station Controller**, having identified the operating cell and all allocated channels in this cell c (Column 7, line 33) "**builds a real-time matrix** of BTS transmission power values for all frequencies and all time slots for all cells". Therefore, the BSC identifies the frequency channels, not the wireless mobile communication apparatus as required by Claim 20.

Further, Wesby fails to teach or suggest, "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", as required by Claim 20.

In addition, Wesby's "**BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies** independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). Wesby does not teach or suggest that the **mobile communication apparatus** (Mobile Station) participates "in **determining whether the desired communication session will be established**" as required by Claim 20. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of Claim 20 is overcome.

Claims 2-4, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18 stand allowable as depending from allowable claims and including further limitations not taught or suggested by the references of record.

2) Claims 5-9, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wesby et al 6,799044 in view of Hukkanen (20040105428). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows:

Claim 5 further defines the apparatus of Claim 1, wherein the input information transfer path includes part of a data network.

Claim 6 further defines the apparatus of Claim 5, wherein the output information transfer path includes part of the data network.

Claim 7 further defines the apparatus of Claim 6, wherein the data network is a public data network.

Claim 8 further defines the apparatus of Claim 7, wherein the public data network includes the Internet.

Claim 9 further defines the apparatus of Claim 1, wherein the output information transfer path includes part of a data network.

Claim 11 further defines the apparatus of Claim 10, wherein the input information transfer path includes part of a data network coupled to the further wireless communication apparatus. Claim 10 further defines the apparatus of Claim 1.

Claim 14 further defines the apparatus of Claim 13, wherein the output information transfer path includes part of a data network coupled to the further wireless communication apparatus. Claim 13 further defines the apparatus of Claim 1.

Claims 5 and 9 depend directly from Claim 1. Independent Claim 1, as amended, requires and positively recites, an information storage apparatus, comprising: "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", "an information storage apparatus coupled to said input for storing said information", "an output for coupling to an output information transfer path that extends to a further wireless communication apparatus", "said information storage apparatus coupled to said output for providing said information to said output" and "said output for, when coupled to said output information transfer path, providing said information to the further wireless communication apparatus for use by the further wireless communication apparatus in determining whether the desired communication session will be established".

In contrast, Wesby teaches a method for distributing C/I performance to all mobile stations, implementing "the well-known ultimate goal that C/I should be homogeneously distributed over all receivers in the network at any point in time." (Column 1, lines 53-55.) Wesby implements this using a base station controller (BSC) to which a number of base stations (BTS) are connected and in which **the BSC contains "means for performing channel allocation** for a particular radio connection **to the mobile station** based upon the calculated signal to interference **estimate** for the mobile station. (Column 3, lines 27-34). The BTS implements the BSC commands: "The BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). The storage of the C/I information "is needed at the BSC", (Column 6, lines 53-54) not the mobile station as required in Claim 1 (or indirectly by Claims 5 and 9). The collected information is based upon field strength (FS) measurements reported by the MS (column 7, line 4). The BSC already knows the "BCCH frequency and the base station identity code BSIC" (Column 7, line 23-24) thereby, **enabling the BSC to identify the operating cell and to identify all allocated channels in this cell c** (Column 7, line 33). Therefore, the MS makes measurements of field strength, but fails to identify **frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus** as required by Claims 5 and 9. The **Base Station Controller**, having identified the operating cell and all allocated channels in this cell c (Column 7, line 33) "**builds a real-time matrix** of BTS transmission power values for all frequencies and all time slots for all cells". Therefore, the BSC identifies the frequency channels, not the wireless mobile communication apparatus as required by Claims 5 and 9.

Similarly, Wesby fails to teach or suggest, "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless**

mobile communication apparatus, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", as required by Claims 5 and 9.

In addition, Wesby's "**BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies** independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). Wesby does not teach or suggest that the **mobile communication apparatus** (Mobile Station) participates "in **determining whether the desired communication session will be established**" as required by Claims 5 and 9.

Hukkanen describes "an arrangement for establishing and maintaining a connection between users' communication devices via a public data network" [0001] in which a data network server **220** maintains a register and at a connection request "checks in the register whether the called device mentioned in the connection request can be reached or not" [0008, 0009 and 0020]. "The server sends the **network address** of the terminal linked to the called device to the terminal linked to the calling device, and the network address of the terminal linked to the calling device to the terminal linked to the called device" [0008]. Conspicuous by its absence is any discussion of the wireless link between the terminal devices and their respective mobile devices. Therefore, the information transferred between devices consists only of network addresses. It is clear that this address information lacks identification of frequency channels. The address information transferred from the server has no impact upon whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established.

Even if, arguendo, Hukkanen teaches what is suggested by the Examiner on page 6, line 14 – page 9, of the Office Action dated April 6, 2006, Hukkanen fails to teach or suggest, "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", as required by Claim 1. Claims 5 and 9 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable for the same reasons set forth above in support of the allowance of Claim 1.

In proceedings before the Patent and Trademark Office, "the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness based upon the prior art". In re Fri*tch*, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (citing In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1471-72, 223 USPQ 785, 787-88 (Fed. Cir. 1984). "The Examiner can satisfy this burden **only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references**", In re Fritch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992)(citing In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988)(citing In re Lalu, 747 F.2d 703, 705, 223 USPQ 1257, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Although couched in terms of combining teachings found in the prior art, the same inquiry must be carried out in the context of a purported obvious "modification" of the prior art. **The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.** In re Gordon, 733 F.2d at 902, 221 USPQ at 1127. Moreover, **it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious.** In re Gorman, 933 F.2d 982, 987, 18 USPQ2d 1885, 1888 (Fed.Cir.1991). See also Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 774 F.2d 1132, 1138, 227 USPQ 543, 547 (Fed.Cir.1985).

Furthermore, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). It is clear from the above analysis that all of the words of Claims 4 and 19 cannot be found in a combination of the Wesby and Hukkanen references, as is required by law. As such, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 5 and 9 must be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8 stand allowable as depending directly, or indirectly, from allowable Claim 5 and including further limitations not taught or suggested by the references of record. Claim 11 stands allowable as depending from Claim 10, which stands allowable as depending from allowable Claim 1 and including further limitations not taught or suggested by the references of record. Claim 14 stands allowable as depending from Claim 13, which stands allowable as depending from allowable Claim 1, including further limitations not taught or suggested by the references of record.

3) Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wesby et al 6,799,044 in view of Kil (20010046855). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows:

Claim 17 further defines the apparatus of Claim 1, wherein said information is indicative of wireless communication resource use in a previous wireless communication session involving the wireless mobile communication apparatus.

Claim 17 depends directly from Claim 1. Independent Claim 1, as amended, requires and positively recites, an information storage apparatus, comprising: "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the**

wireless mobile communication apparatus, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", "an information storage apparatus coupled to said input for storing said information", "an output for coupling to an output information transfer path that extends to a further wireless communication apparatus", "said information storage apparatus coupled to said output for providing said information to said output" and "said output for, when coupled to said output information transfer path, providing said information to the further wireless communication apparatus for use by the further wireless communication apparatus in determining whether the desired communication session will be established".

In contrast, Wesby teaches a method for distributing C/I performance to all mobile stations, implementing "the well-known ultimate goal that C/I should be homogeneously distributed over all receivers in the network at any point in time." (Column 1, lines 53-55.) Wesby implements this using a base station controller (BSC) to which a number of base stations (BTS) are connected and in which **the BSC contains "means for performing channel allocation** for a particular radio connection **to the mobile station** based upon the calculated signal to interference **estimate** for the mobile station. (Column 3, lines 27-34). The BTS implements the BSC commands: "The BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). The storage of the C/I information "is needed at the BSC", (Column 6, lines 53-54) not the mobile station as required by Claim 1 (or Claim 17?). The collected information is based upon field strength (FS) measurements reported by the MS (column 7, line 4). The BSC already knows the "BCCH frequency and the base station identity code BSIC" (Column 7, line 23-24) thereby, **enabling the BSC to identify the operating cell and to identify all allocated channels in this cell c** (Column 7, line 33). Therefore, the MS makes measurements of field strength, but fails to identify **frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus** as required by Claim 1. The **Base Station Controller**, having identified the operating cell and all allocated channels in this cell c (Column 7, line 33) "**builds a real-time matrix** of BTS transmission power values for all frequencies and all time slots for all cells". Therefore, the BSC identifies the frequency channels, not the wireless mobile communication apparatus as required by Claim 1.

Nowhere, however, does Wesby teach or suggest, "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", as required by Claim 1.

In addition, Wesby's "**BTS must assign and un-assign frequencies** independently for each TS (time slot) as commanded by the BSC." (Column 6, lines 46-48). Wesby does not teach or suggest that the **mobile communication apparatus** (Mobile Station) participates "in **determining whether the desired communication session will be established**" as required by Claim 1.

Kil describes a system for informing the cellular subscriber that their call may be dropped by a base station. In step 22 of the process "the corresponding BTS receives information about the received power level from the corresponding mobile station" [0031]. Wireless communication resources are information such as Walsh code, bandwidth, modulation and frequency allocation. Kil describes the mobile station's received power level as a measurement of the propagation loss to the base station, independent of and without relationship to a wireless communication resource. Kil fails to teach or suggest the storing of wireless communication resource information from a previous communication session. His discussion of frame quality and forward frame error rate is concerned with the present communication session. His system informs the cellular subscriber of an imminent call drop through noting the difference between a calculated mobile FER and a power control parameter value commanded of the mobile [0032]. Absent from Kil's description is the use of previous communication session information as required by Claim 17.

Even if, arguendo, Kil teaches what is suggested by the Examiner on page 10 of the Office Action dated April 6, 2006, Kil fails to teach or suggest, "an input for coupling to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus**, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established", as required by Claim 1. Claim 17 depends from Claim 1 and is allowable for the same reasons set forth above in support of the allowance of Claim 1.

In proceedings before the Patent and Trademark Office, "the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness based upon the prior art". In re Fritch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (citing In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1471-72, 223 USPQ 785, 787-88 (Fed. Cir. 1984). "The Examiner can satisfy this burden **only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references**", In re Fritch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992)(citing In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988)(citing In re Lalu, 747 F.2d 703, 705, 223 USPQ 1257, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Although couched in terms of combining teachings found in the prior art, the same inquiry must be carried out in the context of a purported obvious "modification" of the prior art. **The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.** In re Gordon, 733 F.2d at 902, 221 USPQ at 1127. Moreover, **it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious.** In re Gorman, 933 F.2d 982, 987, 18 USPQ2d 1885, 1888 (Fed.Cir.1991). See also Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 774 F.2d 1132, 1138, 227 USPQ 543, 547 (Fed.Cir.1985).

Furthermore, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). It is clear from the above analysis that all of the words of Claims 17 cannot be found in a combination of the Wesby and Kil references, as is required by law. As such, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claim 17 must be withdrawn.

The references of record, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, "coupling an input to an input information transfer path that originates at a wireless mobile communication apparatus, said input for, when coupled to said input information transfer path, **receiving from the wireless mobile communication apparatus information, including identification of frequency channels available for transmitting information to and receiving information from the wireless mobile communication apparatus, for use in determining whether a desired wireless communication session with the wireless mobile communication apparatus will be established**", as required by Claim 17. Accordingly, Claim 17 stands allowable over the cited references.

Accordingly, Claims 1-20 stand allowable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application as the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron O. Neerings

/ Ronald O. Neerings /
Reg. No. 34,227
Attorney for Applicants

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
Phone: 972/917-5299
Fax: 972/917-4418